

**Draft summary of the Engineering and Operations Work Group Meeting
Oroville Facilities Relicensing (FERC Project No. 2100)
May 24, 2002**

The Department of Water Resources (DWR) hosted the Engineering and Operations Work Group on May 24, 2002 via videoconference and conference call.

A summary of the discussions, decisions made, and action items is provided below. This summary is not intended to be a transcript, analysis of the meeting, or to indicate agreement or disagreement with any of the items summarized, except where expressly stated. The intent is to present an informational summary for interested parties who could not attend the meeting.

Attachment 1 Meeting Agenda
Attachment 2 Meeting Attendees

Introduction

Attendees were welcomed to the Engineering and Operations Work Group meeting. The meeting objectives and action items were discussed. The meeting agenda and list of meeting attendees and their affiliations are appended to this summary as Attachments 1 and 2, respectively.

April 26, 2002 Meeting Summary and Action Items

A summary of the April 26, 2002 Engineering and Operations Work Group meeting is posted on the relicensing web site. The Facilitator reviewed the status of action items from that meeting as follows:

Action Item EO# 47: Distribute revised study plans SP-E1.3, SP-E1.4 and SP-E8.
Status: Revised Study Plans were distributed electronically to the Engineering and Operations Work Group.

Frank Caunt representing the Butte Water Commission, explained that Butte County has hired a consultant to examine a proposed project to divert water for consumptive use in the Paradise ridge area, utilizing the Miocene canal which releases into Lake Oroville. He asked whether the feasibility study for the proposed project could be considered under the Oroville Facilities relicensing process and asked if any action is required for evaluating this project. Curtis stated the proposed project is not a relicensing issue; he further stated that it is a State Water Resources Control Board water rights issue. Curtis suggested that Ward Tabor, DWR counsel could be asked to provide clarification. The Facilitator suggested that, depending on the status of the proposal, it might be considered under the cumulative evaluation as a reasonably foreseeable project. Ken Kules with Metropolitan Water District pointed out that the State Water Resources Control Board had jurisdiction over water rights, not FERC and other participants questioned if this was meant to utilize part of Butte County's existing State Water Project annual entitlement. DWR will discuss the proposal with Ed Craddock and then provide clarification regarding the nexus to the relicensing effort.

Update on Plenary Activities

Curtis Creel, DWR Operations Resource Area Manager (RAM) reported that the Plenary Group Modeling Protocol Task Force met on May 16, 2002 and agreed by consensus to recommend a draft Modeling Protocol document to the Plenary Group. That document was distributed at the May 21, 2002 Plenary Group meeting, and the participants are currently reviewing it with the intention of discussing it at the June 25, 2002 Plenary Group meeting.

Update on Engineering and Operations/Environmental Task Force

Curtis Creel reported that the Joint Engineering and Operations/Environmental Task Force met on May 6, 2002 to discuss several environmental Study Plans and modeling needs for SP-W6 and SP-F10. The Joint Task Force also discussed the relationship of terrestrial Study Plan SP-T3/5 to geomorphic Study Plans SP-G1 and SP-G2. He explained that there will need to be additional meetings to discuss some of the fisheries Study Plans and suggested that the next Joint Task Force meeting would probably be held in late June.

Ken Kules asked if we should also place on the agenda for the next Joint Task Force meeting a discussion item on the Fluvial 12 model and any environmental or operational inputs required from other studies. The Work Group agreed the Task Force should discuss the Fluvial 12 issue, and Curtis agreed to put it on the next Joint Task Force agenda.

Watershed Modeling

Curtis reported that he and Ed Craddock, representing Butte County, met and discussed the status of watershed modeling. Ed raised a question about a watershed model currently under development by the US Geological Survey (USGS). Curtis investigated and discovered that DWR is already involved in that modeling effort and the model, Precipitation Runoff Modeling System (PRMS), is a forecasting tool that has already been discussed in the Engineering and Operations Work Group. Curtis explained that PRMS is meant to be part of water supply and inflow forecasting on a short-term basis and not designed to be a long-range planning tool.

Curtis offered to talk with Ed Craddock again and set up a meeting with DWR Flood Management staff and USGS staff near the end of June to discuss whether PRMS could fit into the Oroville Facilities relicensing modeling effort. Ken Kules asked what questions are we trying to answer on a watershed level, and Curtis agreed that he was not sure how watershed modeling would fit in the relicensing process. Ken cautioned about trying to get data to answer very specific questions with a model developed on a gross watershed scale with broad assumptions.

Rashid Ahmad, Engineering RAM, asked how a watershed model such as PRMS might be used by Flood Management and how does that action get evaluated in terms of the relicensing effort. Curtis reminded the Work Group about Yuba County Water Agency's efforts to improve flood forecasting by using a similar rainfall runoff model, and Rashid pointed to the Army Corps of Engineers' studies of forecast based operations of reservoirs as other specific activities that need to be addressed. Ken Kules reminded the Work Group that the Environmental Cumulative Effects/ESA Task Force is almost finished with a guidance document. The guidance document will help Work Groups develop additional Study Plans or tasks necessary to address potential cumulative impacts of the Oroville Facilities when viewed in relation to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects that while beyond DWR control, when viewed together present an impact. The Engineering and Operations Work Group agreed to include a discussion of cumulative effects on the agenda for the next Work Group meeting.

Next Steps

Curtis suggested that it would be advantageous to share whatever information he derives from his discussions related to the watershed modeling issue with the Engineering and Operations Task Force for discussion. Ken suggested we schedule a placeholder date and time for the next Engineering and Operations Task Force meeting and the Work Group agreed that the next meeting would be June 20, 2002 from 1 p.m. to 2 p.m. The meeting would be scheduled as a conference call and is open to anyone that wishes to participate. Logistical information will be distributed in advance of the meeting.

Next Meeting

The Engineering and Operations Work Group agreed to hold another conference call Work Group meeting on:

Date: June 28, 2002

Time: 10:30 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.

Location: Oroville Field Division, Oroville and Joint Operations Center or via conference call in number.

Agreements Made

1. Discuss Fluvial 12 model and cumulative effects at June 28, 2002 Engineering and Operations Work Group meeting.
2. Engineering and Operations modeling Task Force will meet June 20, 2002 to discuss whether watershed modeling is reasonable to use in the relicensing process.

Action Items

Action Item EO#48	Determine to what degree if any, FERC requires evaluation of projects within or adjacent to the Project Boundary such as the proposed water diversion for Paradise ridge.
Responsible:	DWR/consulting team
Due Date:	June 28, 2002
Action Item EO#49	Discuss Fluvial 12 modeling with appropriate DWR and consulting team members to determine data needs.
Responsible:	Joint Engineering and Operations/Environmental Task Force
Due Date:	June 2002
Action Item EO#50	Provide update to the Engineering and Operations Work Group on watershed modeling discussions.
Responsible:	DWR/consulting team
Due Date:	June 28, 2002
Action Item EO#51	Discuss watershed modeling information with Engineering and Operations Task Force and report back to Engineering and Operations Work Group.
Responsible:	DWR/consulting team
Due Date:	Task Force meeting: June 20, 2002; next Work Group meeting: June 28, 2002